

-14-

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed on January 30, 2007, Applicant(s) respectfully request(s) reconsideration.

Claim(s) 1-34 are now pending in this Application.

In this Amendment, claim(s) 1, 10, 20, 29 and 32-34 have been amended and claim 35 added.

Claims 1, 10, 20, 29 and 32-34 are independent claims and the remaining claims are dependent claims.

Applicant(s) believe that the claim(s) as presented are in condition for allowance. A notice to this affect is respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) based on Kato, et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0040431:

Claim(s) 1-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kato, et al., U.S. Publication No. 2002/0040431 (Kato '431). Applicant(s) respectfully disagree with these contentions and assert that the presently claimed invention is not anticipated by any disclosure in the Kato '431 references.

Configurations disclosed herein disclosed XML signatures in a manner that defers PKI (Public Key Infrastructure) overhead, thus benefiting personal devices not equipped with encryption (PKI) capabilities. In contrast, the Kato '431 disclosure solves the problem of multiple applications each having a specialized signature generation capability for each type of application ([0067]). Accordingly, Kato teaches a generalized electronic signature device 10 having generalized signature capability for each of the applications (steps in [0064-0066]), rather than creating/instantiating a SEPARATE capability for assigning signatures for each of a plurality of applications A1..An, as disclosed at [0074]. Nonetheless, the signature device 10 disclosed in Kato nonetheless employs "a function for assigning an XML signature...via a common GUI" [0074].

As such, Kato does not show, teach, or disclose the claimed non-signing client because the non-signing client obtains the signature from a signature

-15-

server 12 distinct from both the source and destination (non-signing client 14 and metalanguage conversant destination 28), corresponding to the document creator signer 10 and document receiver signature verifier 20 in Kato '431. Accordingly, Kato solves the problem of multiple occurrences of signature generation capability by limiting signature assignment to a single, generalized browser [0070]. In contrast, the nonsigning server employs NO signature generation capability, instead obtaining the signature information 33 from the signature server, relieving the non-signing device of burdensome processing associated with the signature generation.

Accordingly, claim 1 has been herein amended to recite that the client is a remote client being a nonsigning client unable to generate the signature block, and that, the signature block [is] receivable by a recipient destination having capability to authenticate the signature, the recipient destination further conversant in the predetermined protocol, to further clarify Applicant's invention. Further discussion and support for this amendment maybe found in the specification at page 19, lines 1-11.

Independent claim 10 has been herein amended to distinguish a self-authenticating message feature, a feature not shown or disclosed in Kato, as described at page 8, lines 7-13 and at page 15, lines 4-10.

Independent claims 20, 29, and 32 – 34 have been herein amended to clarify the scripted metalanague representation of the generated signature, as suggested by the Office Action, to further clarify salient features of Applicant's invention by reciting that the signature block is a script having fields defined by a predetermined metalanguage syntax, the metalanguage syntax defining the position of the covered data portion and corresponding signature, the signature block receivable by a recipient device conversant in the predetermined metalanguage syntax for decoding the message, as described at page 14, lines 11-19 and page 15, lines 21-27.

-16-

Claim 35 has been herein added to clarify the generation of a predetermined bank of signatures by the signature server, a feature not shown or disclosed in Kato, disclosed at page 16, lines 17-23, to further distinguish.

As the remaining claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from claims 1, 10, 20 and 29, it is respectfully submitted that all claims in the case are now in condition for allowance.

Applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this response, including an extension fee, that is not covered by an enclosed check, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3735.

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-9660, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

/CJL

Attorney
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No.: 44,883
Chapin Intellectual Property Law, LLC
Westborough Office Park
1700 West Park Drive
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-9660
Facsimile: (508) 616-9661

Attorney Docket No.: SUN03-06(P9621)

Dated: September 14, 2007